

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ALBANY DIVISION**

|                           |   |                            |
|---------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, | : |                            |
|                           | : |                            |
| v.                        | : | CASE NO.: 1:25-CR-11 (LAG) |
|                           | : |                            |
| FREDERICK DONALD,         | : |                            |
|                           | : |                            |
| Defendant.                | : |                            |
|                           | : |                            |

---

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Defendant Frederick Donald’s Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial in the Interest of Justice (Motion). (Doc. 17). Therein, Defendant moves to continue the pretrial conference and trial in this matter, currently set for June 25, 2025, and June 30, 2025, respectively. (*Id.* at 1; Doc. 16).

On May 14, 2025, Defendant Frederick Donald was charged with two counts of possession with intent to distribute methamphetamine in violation of 21 U.S.C. §§ 841(a)(1) and 841(b)(1)(A). (Doc. 1). Defendant made his initial appearance on May 29, 2025, pleaded not guilty, consented to pretrial detention, and was remanded to the custody of the U.S. Marshals Service. (Docs. 6, 12, 14, 15). On May 30, 2025, the Court entered a Scheduling Order setting the matter for trial, and on June 3, 2025, Defendant filed the instant Motion. (Docs. 16, 17). In the Motion, Defendant’s Counsel represents that he “received discovery on or about May 29, 2025” and “has not yet been able to review the discovery” himself or with Defendant. (Doc. 17 ¶ 2). The Government does not oppose Defendant’s Motion, and this case has not yet been previously continued. (*Id.* ¶ 3; See Docket).

Upon due consideration, the Court finds that the “ends of justice served by the granting of [a] continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial.” 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). Specifically, the Court finds that failing to grant a continuance would result in a miscarriage of justice and deny Defendant’s Counsel the

reasonable time necessary for effective preparation. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i), (iv). Accordingly, Defendant's Motion (Doc. 17) is **GRANTED**, and the delay occasioned by this continuance shall be deemed **EXCLUDABLE** pursuant to the provisions of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the pretrial conference and trial in the above-captioned matter shall be **CONTINUED** to a date to be determined later. The deadlines in the Court's May 30, 2025 Scheduling Order (Doc. 16) are hereby terminated, and a new scheduling order will be forthcoming.

**SO ORDERED**, this 4th day of June, 2025.

/s/ Leslie A. Gardner  
**LESLIE A. GARDNER, CHIEF JUDGE**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**